



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ATTIC ALPHABET IN THUCYDIDES: A NOTE ON
THUCYDIDES 8, 9, 2

BY HENRY WHEATLAND LITCHFIELD

TEXT criticism has few problems, perhaps, in which the individual author's bent and surroundings make larger factors than in that concerning fifth century writers' use of the old Attic alphabet. With no intention of slighting the chronological side, I wish to present some considerations which seem to me to indicate that for Thucydides, at least, such a use is not altogether to be denied. Certainly a comparison of dates alone shows convincingly that of the spurious diphthongs *αι* and *ου* he surely represented *ου* by O, if not also *αι* by E; are there not other considerations which of themselves may go far to justify us in defending with some confidence a more extensive adherence on his part to the older character? The purpose of this paper is, then, in illustration of the natural working upon his text of Thucydides' most certainly attested Atticism, to suggest a correction of a disputed passage in the History, and secondly, without attempting in any sense a complete treatment, to urge several arguments, — in part, I believe, new, — which lead toward assuming both for Thucydides and to a certain extent for other fifth century writers a greater aloofness from the Ionic usage than is generally conceded them.¹

Οὐ ξυγχωρούντων δὲ τῶν Κορινθίων, ἀλλὰ διατριβῆς ἐγγιγνομένης, οἱ 2
'Αθηναῖοι ἤμισθοντο τὰ τῶν Χίων μάλλον, καὶ πέμψαντες ἓνα τῶν στρα-
τηγῶν Ἀριστοκράτη ἐπητιῶντο αὐτούς, καὶ ἀρνούμενων τῶν Χίων,² τὸ
πιστὸν ναὺς σφίσι ξυμπέμπειν ἐκέλευον ἐς τὸ ξυμμαχικόν· οἱ δ' ἔπεμψαν
ἑπτά. αἵτιον δ' ἐγένετο τῆς ἀποστολῆς τῶν νεῶν οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ τῶν 3

¹ This article was suggested by a reading of Rutherford's and Marchant's discussions in their editions of Books IV and II respectively. I wish to acknowledge at once the many suggestions received in its preparation from the Editors, from Professor H. W. Smyth, and Dr. K. K. Smith.

² διὰ is superscript before τὸ by a later hand in the Monacensis.

Χίῳν οὐκ εἰδότες τὰ πρασσόμενα, οἱ δὲ ὀλίγοι <οἱ>¹ ξυνειδότες τὸ τε πλῆθος οὐ βουλόμενοί πω πολέμον ἔχειν, πρὶν τι καὶ ἰσχυρὸν λάβωσι, καὶ τοὺς Πελοποννησίους οὐκέτι προσδεχόμενοι ᾗξειν, ὅτι διέτριβον. — Thuc. 8, 9, 2-3. In this passage the authority of the MS. reading τὸ πιστόν was, to my knowledge, first questioned by Classen in his edition of 1878. Of earlier editors, some had supposed an apposition with ναὺς σφίσι ξυμπέμπειν, some an apposition with ναὺς alone; the article being in either case taken to mean 'that appropriate under the circumstances.'² Admitting the bare possibility of the syntax with ναὺς, Classen on logical grounds preferred that with ξυμπέμπειν, involving an objective construction with ἐκέλευον, in his judgment impossible;³ he therefore deleted τὸ πιστόν as a gloss on ἰσχυρὸν l. 7. In his critical appendix, recanting, he suggests τὸ πυστόν⁴ as the direct object of ἀρνούμενων. Herwerden, 1882, deletes with Classen, and so Stahl, 1883, thinking πιστόν cannot mean 'a security,'⁵ and deriving it through corruption of a gloss τὸ ἄπιστον, in which the object of ἀρνούμενων was specified. Hude, 1890 and 1901, and Jones, 1902, while noting Classen's deletion, read with the MSS.: Tucker, 1892, accepts the apposition with ξυμπέμπειν, citing Jelf, § 580, and the stock instance⁶ Ἑλένην κτάνωμεν Μενέλεωι λύπην πικράν. Goodhart, 1893, who rejects

¹ Inserted by Hude. The Vatican has καὶ συνειδότες.

² E.g., Gölter, 1836: "... verba τὸ πιστόν in appositione sunt verborum ναὺς σφίσι ξυμπέμπειν, quasi scripsisset ὁ τὸ πιστόν εἴη. v. Matth. § 410, 432. Herm. ad Soph. Tr. 559, coll. v. 218. Et τὸ πιστόν recte Duk. iungit cum verbis ἐς τὸ ξυμμαχικόν, naves, quae fidem facerent sive pignoris loco essent, eos in societate mansuros. Ita Thuc. 3, 11, τὸ ἀντίπαλον δέος μόνον πιστόν ἐς ξυμμαχίαν." Krüger,² 1861: "τὸ πιστόν ist Apposition zu ναὺς: Schiffe als Garantie. (Stephanus) Der Artikel bezeichnet die gehörige, erforderliche. Spr. 50, 2, 4. — ἐς τὸ ξυμμαχικόν verbindet Duker mit τὸ πιστόν. vgl. 3, 11, 1: πιστόν ἐς ξυμμαχίαν. Für ξυμμαχία stehe τὸ ξυμμαχικόν auch 3, 91, 1 und Her. 9, 106, 3. Doch widerstrebt die Stellung: auch wäre das müßig. . . ." and so Böhme,² ad loc., 1862.

³ Ed.² 1885, ad loc. p. 16: "... die Garantie würde doch nicht in den ναὺς, sondern in dem ξυμπέμπειν ναὺς bestehn, wozu τὸ πιστόν bei ἐκέλευον nicht Apposition sein kann. . . ."

⁴ 1, 5, 2 might have been cited for a similar confusion by the later hand of the Laurentian.

⁵ Ad loc.: "... τὸ πιστόν nusquam pignus significat, sed de sponsione dicitur pactionibus et iuramentis confirmata, quae sententia, quocunque τὸ πιστόν refertur, ab hoc loco alienissima est."

⁶ Eur. Orest. 1105.

any appositional construction, and so far follows Stahl as to deny for *πιστόν* the meaning of 'pledge' elsewhere in Thucydides, but thinks the sequence of thought impaired by deleting outright, contents himself with marking a corruption, and suggesting its explanation.¹

To summarize: while the loose appositional accusative instanced in Eur. *Orest.* 1105, whether construed with the infinitive phrase or with the main sentence, is probably impossible for the prose even of Thucydides, certainly for the plain narrative style of this passage, yet in close apposition with *ξυμπέμπειν* the text *τὸ πιστόν* may conceivably stand as the direct object of *ἐκέλευον*,² its harshness somewhat excused by the apposition and by the arrangement of the words; and in any case, the construction with *ναῦς* alone, though logically inferior, is correct and gives good sense. Nor are the position of the words and the use of the article, while surprising, altogether unnatural in view of the precedence of *ἀρνούμένων τῶν Χίων*: it is rash, furthermore, whatever the stereotyped connotation of *τὰ πιστά*, to deny absolutely for Thucydides in the singular a general force elsewhere abundantly evidenced in the specific plural. But, after all is said, construction, order, article, and diction are alike harsh and unusual, especially in the straightforward narrative style: even after due allowance for the unrevised state of the Eighth Book, their combined effect renders it almost incredible that Thucydides intended what now stands in our text; although, since the objections can severally be met with some plausibility, they do not justify so slight a change from the MSS. (an evident difficulty in whose

¹ *Ad loc.*: "It must, I think, be admitted that to take *τὸ πιστόν* as in apposition either to *ναῦς* or to *ναῦς σφίσι ξυμπέμπειν* is very harsh if not impossible. Both the article and the position of the words are against it. . . . Further, though the context is intelligible without them, it is not altogether natural. The following sentences proceed to explain the sending of the ships on the understanding that they were asked for and sent *as hostages*. Of course this may be inferred in any case, but I think a careful reading of the whole passage produces the impression that Thucydides in the first sentence intends some expressed, as well as implied, allusion to the fact. If this is so it seems possible that the text originally ran, *καί, ἀρνούμένων τῶν Χίων, ἐπίστουν, ναῦς σφίσι ξυμπέμπειν κελεύοντες ἐς τὸ ξυμμαχικόν*. For *ἐπίστουν*, cp. IV, 88, 1, *πιστώσαντες αὐτὸν τοῖς ὄρκοις*. The comparative rarity of the word might account for the corruption, while the final syllable of *κελεύοντες* would easily drop out before *ἐς*."

² On the analogy of Dem. 48, 14 cited by L & S s.v. I, 4, and the passive *τὸ κελευόμενον*; cp. Aesch. *Eum.* 618.

reading is, of course, testimony to its genuineness) as that suggested by Goodhart. That is, unless some solution of the problem more satisfactory to stylistic criticism presents itself, not involving departure from MS. authority, *τό πιστόν* must stand and be interpreted in the traditional way.

One such solution, which seems to me correct, would make this passage typical of the condition of text produced by a mistransliteration from the earlier Attic writing: it presupposes the correctness of the most conservative view which assumes any adherence whatsoever on Thucydides' part to the older character,—the view, namely, that he did not employ *OY* = *ov* spurious.¹ If this is right, does it not follow that here, reverting to his favorite articular infinitive of purpose, he wrote *ΤΟΠΙΞΤΟΝ* = *τοῦ πιστοῦν*, misinterpreted *τό πιστόν* by the transliterator? whose error was due to the unfamiliarity of the verb, not lessened in its absolute use, and to the singular coincidence in form with another construction equally characteristic of his author, here inapposite.²

We have seen that perhaps the most insidious "Attic alphabet error" is of the sort to produce in the text a difficulty appreciable to be sure, but at the same time not sufficiently serious to warrant rejection of the MS. reading; the application of the critical principle thus suggested has been confined within the limits of the usage *O* = spurious *ov*, somewhat arbitrarily but, I trust, not unreasonably ascribed to Thucydides. It may now be asked: Are there other, though less strong, probabilities which justify us in contemplating for him additional Attic usages? ³

¹ Here the Ionicism first becomes regular in public inscriptions about the year 353, half a century later than the virtually universal adoption in such inscriptions of the alphabet as introduced by Euclides: see also below, p. 154.

² For the verb, cp. 4, 88, 1; for its absolute use, assumed by Goodhart (see above, p. 131, n. 1), Hdt. 8, 76, *κυκλοῦμενοι* (?), not elsewhere used absolutely by Herodotus; for the construction, esp. 1, 4 and 8, 39, 4: for similar corruptions (see below, pp. 143, 144, n. 5 *fin.*, 148) of the article, 2, 81, 4; 87, 1; 102, 4; 3, 82, 4; 6, 14; 7, 67, 1; 71, 2 (?); 8, 87, 3, and of the infinitive, 7, 63, 1, *ἄξιον* (see below, p. 144, n. 5 *fin.*) and ? 71, 2, *ἀνώμαλον*.

³ In the following pages M denotes Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*,³ 1900; L I the first, L the second volume of Larfeld, *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik*, 1902-1907. References to these books, unless otherwise stated, are by pages. References to inscriptions, unless otherwise stated, are to *I G*; *I S* designates the *Supplement* of vol. I, the pages of which are noted in parentheses.

Writers on the use by literary men of the Attic alphabet¹ have, so far as I am aware, been content to affirm either that a given author used, or that he did not use, the older character;² between indiscriminate assertion and denial may not a third and more tenable theory present itself? namely, that, for instance, Thucydides wrote the History with a system of script neither purely Attic nor purely Ionic, but compounded of the two. We know this was the practice of contemporary inscriptions: is it likely to have been that of men of letters, and in particular of Thucydides? Each writer's system, unlike the systems of many inscriptions, would, we may fairly presume, be consistent; but

¹ See in support of the view that Thucydides employed the old Attic alphabet, Rutherford, *Θουκυδίδου Τεράφρη*, 1889, introd. lxxiii ff.; Marchant's edition of Book II, 1903, introd. xxvi ff.; and *contra*, Wilamowitz, *Μεταγραψάμενοι*, in *Homerische Vorfragen, Philologische Untersuchungen*, VII (1884), pp. 301 ff.; and *Herakles*,¹ 1889, vol. I, p. 126, n. 6. Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*, 1895, pp. 69 ff., esp. 71-73, notes certain clear defects of Wilamowitz' argument, but while disallowing it for Homer, accepts with him the Ionic alphabet for the dramatists. See further Stahl, *Quaestiones Grammaticae ad Thucydidem pertinentes*,² 1886, p. 43: "Cum optimorum librorum consensu comprobetur Th. ἐς pro εἰς dixisse (nam temere Meisterh. § 49, 5 [M 213 f.] suspicatur hanc esse antiquiorem scribendi rationem ab Alexandrinis relictam, cum nulla sint [!] indicia quibus Th. antiquiore litteratura usum esse appareat, quam ne Euripidem quidem adhibuisse eius fragm. 385 Dind. ostendit), etiam in ἐσω eum sibi constitisse et ne in dupliciter quidem compositis ἐπεω- tolerandum esse putamus."

On literary usage in general, see Boeckh, *Ueber die kritische Behandlung der Pindarischen Gedichte*, 1820-1822, in his *Gesammelte Kleine Schriften*, 1871, vol. V, pp. 290 ff.; Gardthausen, *Griechische Palaeographie*, 1879, pp. 106 f.; Wilamowitz, *ll. cc.*, passim; Köhler, *Die attischen Grabsteine des fünften Jahrhunderts*, in *Mittheilungen des deutschen archäologischen Institutes in Athen*, X (1885), pp. 359 ff., esp. 378; Ludwich, *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik*, part II, 1885, pp. 420 ff., esp. 425, 428; Blass, in Müller's *Handbuch*, I², 1892, pp. 301 ff.; Cauer, *op. cit.*: on the Attic alphabet, Schütz, *Historia Alphabeti Attici*, 1875, pp. 58-61; Cauer, *De Dialecto Attica Vetustiore*, in Curtius' *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik*, VIII (1875), pp. 223 ff., 399 ff.; Köhler, *op. cit.*; Roberts-Gardner, *Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*, 1887-1905, I, 103 ff., II, introd. xi ff.; Kretschmer, *Die griechischen Vasenschriften*, 1894, pp. 94 ff.; M 2 ff., 20 f., 26 f., 85 ff.; L I 398 f., L 389 ff.

² See, however, on the diphthongs, Wilamowitz, *Hom. Vorfr.*, p. 306, cp. 324 ff.; Blass, *op. cit.*, p. 302. Certainly I have nowhere found contemplated only partial adoption in literary usage of the Euclidean reforms.

that, disregarding local usage, it would be quite identical with the Ionic, which was probably used in bookmaking for the general trade of Greece,¹ is a supposition neither intrinsically probable nor borne out by the evidence at our disposal. It may, I think, fairly be presumed that, with all allowance for mistakes of cutting which the state thought it not worth while to rectify, the stones enable us to reconstruct accurately enough for our purpose the writing of the *γραμματεῖς* who prepared the decrees for inscription. Transference of the familiar Attic H, relieved from duty by the weakening of the *spiritus asper*,² to the sound η would among literary men, faddists excepted, as among secretaries, be more readily accomplished than the introduction for ω of the strange character Ω .³ More significant for the usage of writers contemporary with Thucydides is that development of pronunciation traceable in the spurious diphthongs $\epsilon\iota$ and $\omicron\upsilon$, for which Attic E and O were not superseded in inscriptions until B.C. 376 and 353 respectively. Scarcely can literary usage have ignored a discrepancy which must, it seems plain from these dates, have existed at some time in polite speech, by however much the actual change may have preceded its reflection in the inscriptions. It follows that at some time, — for our present purpose it matters not when,⁴ — literary men at Athens must have written spurious $\epsilon\iota$ with the digraph EI, in this use formerly peculiar to Ionic, spurious $\omicron\upsilon$ with the peculiarly Attic O, and, therefore, must have employed a mixed alphabet. Perhaps least of them all should we expect Thucydides to have adhered to either system exclusively, in view of his acknowledged

¹ Cp. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 305.

² Cp. L 451.

³ Cp. in Greek, e.g., I, 51 *S* (15), where $H = \eta$ but $\omega = O$, and I, 283, 1-20, where $\eta = H$, $\omega = O$ and Ω ; in Latin both the early absorption by $C = g$ of the K-function, without regard to the ambiguity resulting from the assumption by C of a double meaning, and on the other hand the failure of Claudius' justifiable innovations. Of course it may be argued that a new letter would be more easily introduced than an old, fixed character change its significance; see L 438 and Kretschmer, *op. cit.*, p. 104, there cited. But the evidence of the stones, which decide otherwise, is here rather to be followed: see below, pp. 142, 151, M 4, L 445 ff.

⁴ Yet the full phonetic identification of the spurious with the corresponding genuine diphthongs can hardly have preceded the adoption of Archinus' alphabet by the state, much less its adoption by men of letters.

use (however motivated¹) of Ionic -σσ- by the side of Attic ξύν²—forms never coexistent in either Attic or historical Ionic prose.³

If, then, we grant that the pure alphabets are for literary Athens simply extremes of a development, the sequence of this, with the place therein of Thucydides, should be determined as accurately as possible. First it seems reasonable, if not necessary, to infer from the evidence of the inscriptions that Archinus' decree was intended to substitute for somewhat loose official convention a definite statutory provision; that,—following perhaps a precedent already obtaining among polite Athenian society,—he sought to banish from public inscriptions the irregularities of a constantly increasing but fluctuating Ionicism, then going beyond actual phonetic needs, and to establish conformity with Ionic usage, so far as pronunciation might permit.⁴ What was the nature of the fluctuation which Archinus aimed to check? how far was it arbitrary, how far governed by principles more or less fixed? It was motivated, we may be sure, by several considerations. Precision would be an object: thus the introduction of Η = η and Ω was promoted from the first. There would be a desire to register the loss or weakening of aspiration which perhaps by the middle of the fifth century had at Athens nearly or quite arrived at the point reached in Ionia long before. Perhaps this stage was attained earlier in the case of χσ and φσ than in that of the initial *spiritus asper*.⁵ The entire failure of the Athenians to make use of the available ΚΞ and ΓΞ indicates that their adoption of Ξ and Υ was motivated rather by the desire to get rid of a cumbersome digraph than by regard for what must, in any case, have been extreme *minutiae* of pronunciation. In the case of Λ = λ and Γ innovation or, with more conservative writers, uniformity alone can have been the motive. Conservatives, again, would be reluctant, radicals eager, to

¹ See Wilamowitz, *Hom. Vorfr.*, p. 313.

² Cp., e.g., the forms of ξυντάσσω, 6, 98, 2; 7, 3, 19; 81, 25; etc.

³ Is it not, furthermore, of some significance that whatever Gorgias' influence upon Thucydides (cp. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, p. 313), he was independent enough of Ionism, with which historiography was identified by the precedent of Herodotus and the lesser writers, to make Ionic forms quite the exception in his History? Cp. Marchant's ed. of Book II, introd. pp. xxvii f.

⁴ Hence the exception in practice with regard to the spurious diphthongs ει and ου; see above, p. 134.

⁵ Cp. L 452, n. 6.

adopt the strange characters $\Omega \Gamma \Xi \Psi$; nor must we fail to allow for the difficulty of dissociating Λ from γ , H from the rough breathing.

Any attempt to decide *a priori* which of these considerations would in each case predominate over another must result in the merest theory: we can only guess that conservative people would be slower to adopt Ionic usage in general, and in particular to adopt new characters than to give the old new significations; radicals the reverse. What, then, is our evidence with regard to the actual practice of the Athenians? In the absence of direct ancient testimony on the subject, we have recourse to the yet extant inscriptions. An interesting summary of the evidence from red-figured vases is given, with a table, by Kretschmer:¹

“... die Steinmetzen, welche im Staatsauftrage arbeiteten, vergassen sich zuweilen und setzten ionische Buchstaben für attische ein. Diese für die Uebergangsperiode charakteristische Mischung der alten und der neuen Schrift veranschaulichen auch die rotfigurigen Vasen dieser Zeit, von denen eine Auswahl in der nebenstehenden Tabelle zusammengestellt ist. Aus dieser Uebersicht ergibt sich die interessante Thatsache, dass die einzelnen ionischen Buchstaben sich nicht alle gleichzeitig im Schriftgebrauch festgesetzt haben. Am frühesten treten die Zeichen Ξ und Ψ auf: in keiner Vaseninschrift, welche überhaupt ionische Buchstaben enthält, ist ξ oder ψ noch nach attischer Weise ausgedrückt. Nicht viel jünger sind Λ für λ und Γ für γ , doch wechselt noch öfter \vee mit Λ , und Polygnot, der schon Ψ anwendet, schreibt seinen Namen in rein attischer Schrift. Am spätesten hat sich H für η einzubürgern vermocht: auf keiner einzigen der oben aufgeführten Vasen ist η schon durchweg nach ionischer Weise bezeichnet; es ist den Athenern offenbar etwas schwer geworden, einen Buchstaben, mit welchem sie bis dahin den Hauch zu bezeichnen gewohnt waren, nun zum Ausdruck eines bestimmten *e*-Lautes zu verwenden. . . .” That is, the vase-painters had taken the Ionic alphabet into common use long before the year of Euclides: and they were ready to employ unfamiliar characters, far more so in fact than to dissociate familiar characters from their established values; as is shown by the early use of $\Xi \Psi$, by the precedence of Γ over $\Lambda = \lambda$, and by the especially marked comparative lateness of $H = \eta$.

¹ *Gr. Vaseninschriften*, pp. 103 ff.

Of the other considerable body of evidence, that of the stones, no summary similar to Kretschmer's has come to my knowledge; with a view to presenting such a summary, I have drawn up¹ a table (see pp. 138-141), which includes all the Attic inscriptions in a mixed alphabet,—disregarding aspiration, sigma, and the spurious diphthongs,—catalogued by Larfeld, with some additions from other sources.² It may therefore be assumed to be reasonably complete; or if but a selection, surely an impartial one: that in every detail it should be found free of error I cannot hope, but I have no hesitation in warranting that such mistakes as it may contain do not appreciably affect the conclusions to be drawn from it.

A brief comparison of this table with that of Kretschmer shows the evidence of the stones at variance in every particular with that of the vases. What is clear from a detailed study of the phenomena may be roughly presented in figures as follows.³ The sound ξ, to leave the rare ψ out of account, is written only ΧΞ in twenty (eighteen?) inscriptions which show some Ionic usage;⁴ only ΞΞ in three⁵ inscriptions which show no other.⁶ Closer study of these cases serves, I think, only to confirm the view that ΞΞ and impliedly Υ, so far from being the earliest Ionic usages to come into common use, are, in fact, later not

¹ On the basis of L 389-450.

² I have examined carefully the lists of Schütz (*Hist. Alph. Att.*, pp. 58 ff.) and of Lolling (*Kατάλογος τοῦ ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἐπιγραφικοῦ Μουσείου*, vol. I¹, 1899). The Nike inscription (Cavvadias, *Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική*, 1897, pp. 177 ff.; cp. Roberts-Gardner, *Introduction*, II, n. 4, pp. 8 f.) is not included in the table, as its mixed character seems to be due to the fact that it contains two distinct hands, or at least styles, the first pure Attic, the second pure Ionic: with it may be compared I 51 S (15).

³ In these enumerations artists' signatures are regarded as distinct inscriptions. No account is taken of private inscriptions, which seem in any case too few to give validity to conclusions drawn from them. As a matter of fact, in the only instance in which their testimony can carry any weight, it coincides with that of the public inscriptions: Η = η appears in three (five, counting I 403 and S (183) 418 h) private inscriptions which show ω = only Ο, Ω = ω in one (but see also I 358) which shows η = only Ε. Perhaps this paradox might be explained, were explanation needful, on the reasonable assumption that the average private inscription, while certainly in advance of public usage, would yet be more conservative than the vase paintings.

⁴ I 93, 299, and 443 are not counted.

⁵ Counting I 87.

⁶ Cp., however, I 283, 1-20; 299; S (183) 418 h.

ATTIC INSCRIPTIONS WITH MIXED ALPHABET¹

	<i>h</i>	η	ω	γ	λ	ξ	ψ	σ	
[*S (181) 373 ⁹⁵]		E 3 ^{*1} a	O 1		Λ 1			* \lesssim 3	$\Theta = \phi$ 1
S (134) 2 a		E 8	O 9 Ω 2		\vee 5	+ \lesssim 1		\lesssim	$\Omega = \alpha$ 1
[358]	H 1	E 2	O 1		\vee 2			\lesssim 2	$\Omega = \omega \vee$ 1
[S (182) 373 ^{121, 19}]		E 1 H 2	O 1		\vee 1			\lesssim 2	$O \Omega = \omega \vee$ 1
[S (90) 373 ¹⁰¹]	H 1? b	E 1 H 1?		Λ 1?	Λ 1?			\lesssim 2	
[*418]		E 2 ^{*1}	O 1 ^{*1}	Γ 1	Λ 1			\lesssim 3 ^{*1}	
S (51) 505 a	-1 (2?)	E 2			Λ 1			\lesssim 3	
[S (51) 507 a]	-1 H 1	E 2						\lesssim 3	
[S (191) 561]		E 2	Ω 2	Γ 1	Λ 4			\lesssim 7	
13		E 8 (7?)	O 10 (9?)	Λ 2 (1?)	\vee 5 (Λ 1?)		\vee 2	\lesssim	
[398] [*]	H 1	H 1		Γ 1	Λ 2			\lesssim 4	
438		E 4	O 4		\vee 3 Λ 1			\lesssim 9	
440		E 2 (1?)	O 3		\vee 2	Ξ 2		\lesssim	
23 a	H 1	E 2 H 1		Λ 1?	\vee 3			\lesssim 2	
[422]		H 3			\vee 1			\lesssim 5	
[S (113) 491 ¹]	-1	H 5	Ω 1	Γ 1	\vee 2			\lesssim 3	
499		H 2	\square 1		Λ 1			\lesssim (S?) 1	
S (190) 528 ¹	H 1	H 2		A 1 <i>sic</i>	\vee 1			\lesssim 3	
[*S (183) 418 h] ^c	H 2	H 1 ^{*1}	O 4		\vee 2 ^{*2}	Ξ (Ξ ?) 1		\lesssim 2 ^{*1}	
449	H 2	E 25 H 1	O 8	Λ 3	\vee 19	X \lesssim 5		\lesssim	

ATTIC INSCRIPTIONS WITH MIXED ALPHABET (continued)

	h	η	ω	γ	λ	ξ	ψ	σ
$\dagger^{a51} S(15)$	—	E I H	O	$\Lambda \Gamma$ I	$\vee \Lambda$ I	$\times \lesssim$	$(\phi \lesssim)$	W
$S(148) 321, n. 1$	(H —)	E	O	Λ	$\vee (\Lambda)$	$\times \lesssim$		W
$S(148) 321, n. 2$	(H —)	E	O	$\Lambda (\Gamma)$	$\vee (\Lambda)$	$\times \lesssim$		W
324	(H +)	E (H)	O	Λ	\vee	$\times \lesssim$	$(\phi \lesssim)$	W
$S(18, 126) 61 a$	(H —)	EH	O Ω	Λ	$\vee \Lambda$	$\times \lesssim$	$\phi \lesssim$	W
$S(68) 62 a$			Ω I			$\times \lesssim$ I		W
$S(77, 130, 178) 331 e$	(H +)	E	O	Λ	$\vee_4 (\Lambda)$	$\times \lesssim$ I		W
258	— I	E γ H 3	O $_2$	Λ I	\vee_9		$\phi \lesssim$ I	W
189 b	—	EH	O	$\Lambda_2 \Gamma_2$	$L_3 \Lambda_8$			W
190	— $_2$	E $_2$ H 3		Λ I ?	\vee_3			W
146 S(26)		E I H I	O I Ω I		\vee I			W
$S(134) 5 a, 21-24$		H I	O $_2$	Λ I	\vee_3			W
$S(134) 5 a, 1-4$		H I	O I Ω I	Γ I				W
70	— I	E I	O $_2$	Γ I				W
$S(72) 272 a$		E $_3$		Γ I	\vee_2			W
$S(79, 178) 337 a$		E $_2$ H 4		Γ_2	Λ I			W
[$S(205) 373^{211}$]		E I H 3	O I	Γ_2				W
\dagger^{b443}	H I	E H I	O Ω I	Λ I Γ I	$\vee \Lambda$ I	$\times \lesssim$		W
$S(110) 462 a$	— $_2$	E $_2$	O I	Γ I				W
$S(186) 462 f$	H I ?	E	O	Λ	$\vee \Lambda$ I	$\times \lesssim$ I ?		W

[S(120) 507 b]	-1	E ₁ ? H ₃	O ₂	Γ ₁	Λ ₄				
S(64) 35 b	H	EH ₁ ? ^a	O	Λ	υ	Χ	Ξ	W	W
325	(H + -)	EH ₁		Λ ₁				W	W
* 335		E ₄ * ₁ * H ₁		Λ ₁				W	W
[S(81) 373 ²⁰]		E ₁ H ₁							
[S(186) 422 ¹⁷]	-1	E ₁ H ₁			Λ ₁				
450		EH ₁	O		υ	Χ	Ξ	W	W
S(121) 521 d	H ₂	E ₃ H ₁						W	W
[523] ^d	H ₁ (2 ?)	E ₁ ? H ₁ (2 ?)		Λ ₁ ?	Λ ₁ ?			W	W
106		E ₂		Λ ₁	Λ ₁			W	W
187	H ₁	E ₂	O ₁		Λ ₁			W	W
210	-1	E	O	Λ	υ	Λ ₁		W	W
S(167) 225 b	-1	E	O ₂	Λ	υ ₂ Λ ₁	Χ	Ξ ₂	W	W
87	-2	E			υ	Ξ ₁		W	W
[S(119) 492 c]			Ω ₁			Χ	Ξ ₁		

^a By two hands: the second writes pure Attic, the first as indicated in the table. The inscription contains one E by the first hand, one H by the first hand corrected to E by the second.

^b The title is pure Ionic, the text pure Attic.

^c A variant.

^d Not certainly classified.

merely than $\Lambda = \lambda$ and Γ but even than $H = \eta$. Again, Γ appears in two inscriptions which show $\lambda =$ only υ ; $\Lambda = \lambda$ in fourteen (thirteen?) inscriptions which show $\gamma =$ only Λ . On the stones, then, $\Lambda = \lambda$ seems to have preceded rather than followed Γ . Furthermore, not to insist that $H = \eta$ is perhaps of all Ionic usages the most commonly occurring in inscriptions which show any trace thereof, it appears in fourteen (thirteen?)¹ inscriptions which show $\omega =$ only O , whereas $\Omega = \omega$ appears in but one² inscription which shows $\eta =$ only E .³ It follows from each of these items that with secretaries⁴ the objection to introducing new characters was stronger than that to dissociating the old from their established meanings. Just why Γ should have preceded $\Xi\Upsilon$, if such be the case, it is hard to say: possibly $\Lambda = \lambda$ as a familiar letter was introduced for conformity's sake before considerations of pronunciation and convenience secured the adoption of the unfamiliar not to say uncouth $\Xi\Upsilon$; ambiguity resulting thereupon, for clearness' sake Γ may have been taken over. But a complete correlation of the consonantal changes with each other and with the adoption of $H = \eta$ and Ω ,⁵ is probably impossible in our poverty of evidence: it is enough to note the general principle which seems among the secretaries and engravers to have been almost universally operative, and in particular the precedence of $H = \eta$ over Ω .⁶ Such proportions and conclusions may, of course, be the effect simply of that chance which has preserved for our study only a few inscriptions. I cannot but believe that they reveal a deeper meaning, that if we had the combined evidence of all Attic inscriptions the result would be not different from that so consistently indicated by the random selection actually at our disposal.

The conservative temper of Thucydides would, we may guess, bring his usage nearer to that of the secretaries than to that of the vase-

¹ Not counting in either case I S (183) 418 h.

² Not counting I 93.

³ On the use of H and Ω in private inscriptions, see above, p. 137, n. 3.

⁴ Or with stone-cutters? but it seems more likely that these followed the copy set for them by the *γραμματεῖς*.

⁵ It is, of course, to be remembered that all these changes preceded the general adoption of $E| =$ spurious ϵ , this in turn that of $OY =$ spurious ov : cp. above, pp. 134, 135, n. 4; L 401.

⁶ For a similar precedence, cp. the Abu-Simbel inscriptions, L I 398.

painters.¹ His true status in the alphabetic development must be determined with reference to two classes of evidence: internal, derived from a study of his text, and external, from a correlation of the principal dates of his life with those of the inscriptional development; the former, as the less intangible, may first receive attention.

Of this the ideal treatment naturally presupposes, together with constant reference to Hude's apparatus, minute study of the entire text such as might discover any hitherto unsuspected errors of transliteration: I have been unable to do more than examine that apparatus, accounting on the theory of transliteration, so far as possible, for errors which, independently of any such consideration, had already caused serious difficulty. For the text of Thucydides seems comparatively free from so-called "Attic alphabet" emendations; yet such as have been suggested² I have felt at liberty to use. Nor should we hesitate, I think, to lay stress upon an emendation, however motived, simply because it has failed of reception into conservative texts. For the same reasons which, in the absence of an alphabetical hypothesis, must prevent us from receiving any emendation of τὸ πῖστρον into the text,³ no emendation similar to those which are countenanced by such an hypothesis should, unless the MS. reading were downright impossible, have been received into a reasonably conservative text. If the MS. reading were almost incredible, the text might have a crux marked; probably it should not, if the emendation were merely preferable. But it seems likely that only in extremely rare cases would the transliterator evolve an impossible reading: his error would be to choose the somewhat inferior? Hence it is most improbable that in the absence of an alphabetical hypothesis the true reading perverted by the transliterator would often, if ever, appear in a conservative text. It follows that even merely preferable emendations are worth citing, always, of course, with a discrimination of their probability.

A Thucydidean transliterator would not, we may fairly presume, fall ordinarily into errors either careless or absurd, but rather into errors proceeding from a misinterpretation so subtle as to have escaped his passing

¹ Cp. L 396 and 408.

² E.g., 1, 3, 2 ξχειν (Reiske); 2, 76, 4 ἀνεῖλκον (Rutherford); 7, 25, 6 ἀνεῖλκον (Widmann).

³ See above, pp. 131 f.

notice. Most misinterpretations of such a nature should be detected by a method of collecting evidence similar to that here followed: on the reasonable hypothesis of a transliteration based upon accurate knowledge of fifth century forms,¹ they are more likely to have occurred and therefore rather to be considered than orthographical mistakes arising either from an Atticising μεταχαρακτηρισμός or, in the confusions between η and ε more probably, from a similarity of sound; for in estimating the evidence of the variants given below it must, of course, be borne in mind that during nearly all the period of transmission, while ο and ω and perhaps even ου have in point of pronunciation stood nearer together than ε and η, yet an almost complete identity of sound favored interchange of η and ε.² The transliterator's error then will usually be, not of form, but of syntax or relevance to the less immediate context: it must, in order to admit detection, have sprung from a misinterpretation, once more, so subtle as to have escaped his notice, while still remaining perceptible to the critic. Coming to a classification of such errors, we have first to ask in connection with what characters they were most likely to occur.

Presuming a careful transliteration, we should not look to find trace of the Attic form of the consonants,³ and to my knowledge none has with certainty been shown;⁴ the almost inevitable failure to identify correctly in every case E and O involves a possibility of twelve classes of error.⁵

¹ Cp. Wilamowitz, *Hom. Vorfr.*, p. 314.

² On these points cp. Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 313 f.

³ An indeterminate class, small and very subtle, of haplographies, etc., excepted: naturally this appears for the vowels also. Cp. Cauer, *Grundfragen*, p. 73.

⁴ Mere possibilities are for Ξ = ξ, 3, 67, 7 τοὺς ξύμπαντας < ΤΟΞΥΜΠΑΝΤΑΣΞ = τὸ ξύμπαν τὰς: for ΧΞ = ξ, 8, 9, 3 καὶ συνειδότες < ΧΞΥΝΕΙΔΟΤΕΞ (Κ = καί?) = ξυνειδότες; 45, 3 ἐδίδασκε < ΕΔΙΔΑΧΞΕ = ἐδίδαξε: for Λ = γ, 2, 37, 1 δέ; 3, 45, 4 τόγχε < ΤΟΔΕΛΕ = τὸδε γε; 75, 4 ὀπισθεὶς < ΟΡΛΙΞΘΕΞ = ὀργισθεὶς; 4, 20, 3 τε γνῶτε < ΤΕΝΔΟΤΕ = τ' ἐνδῶτε; 64, 3 δέ; 7, 82, 1 and 8, 24, 6 γούν < ΔΟΥ (?) Ν = δ' οὖν; 8, 92, 8 μόγυς < ΜΟΛΙΞ = μόλις; 97, 2 ἦγχε < ΕΔΕ = ἦδε; not 29, 2 Λ = τρία < Υ = τριάκοντα.

⁵ In each citation the reference is followed immediately by the MS. reading which is supposed to have arisen through mistransliteration. In the more difficult passages this is followed by a tentative reconstruction of the original text, this by a transliteration showing what Thucydides intended. For details of MS. readings and emendations the reader is referred to Hude's apparatus. In a note under each class are given:

I. E = η.¹

1. E = η is transliterated ε. I, 35, 4; 37, 2; 57, 1; 75, 3; and 2, 8, 1 δέ; 44, 2 ἐθας; 63, 1 ἀπήχθεσθε; 67, 3; 68, 7; and 74, 3 δέ; 3, 17, 1 κάλλει < KANVEI = κάλλη; 26, 2; 48, 1; and 61, 2 δέ; 4, 93, 1 ἐπεὶ δέ; 5, 10, 10; 55, 4; and 6, 69, 1 δέ; 7, 13, 2 τε δὴ; 87, 2 δῦψαι; 8, 70, 1 δέ, δέ.²

2. E = η tr. ε. Not found.³

3. E = ε tr. η. 5, 66, 2 δὴ; 6, 89, 2 δ' ἡμῶν.⁴

I. Possible but improbable cases of mistransliteration; II. Possible cases of independent transliteration which indicate (A) that the distinct families of MSS. are derived through independent transliterations, or (B) that alternatives originating in one or in several parallel transliterations were recorded and thereafter perpetuated as variant readings; III. Apparent cases of mistransliteration due to certainly independent error on the part of one or more MSS. Under this head are instanced late confusions of the sounds ο and ω, η and ε, with other errors less easily assignable.

In the few cases where the Vatican manuscript alone has preserved what seems to be the correct transliteration, I have usually for the purposes of this paper presumed it to be either independent or the result of an emendation. The latter view is, of course, always possible, cp. Goodhart's ed. of Book VIII, introd. pp. xxxiii ff.; utterly undetermined as is the status of this MS., it is certainly not obligatory.

¹ Cp. I. 1, 33, 1 καταθῆσθε; 72, 2 ἀποκωλύει; 95, 1 ἥδη δέ < ΕΔΕ = ἥδη; 137, 2 ἀπομνήσσεσθαι < ΑΓΟΜΝΕCΘΕCΕCΘΑΙ (cp. Wilamowitz, *Hom. Vorfr.*, p. 307) = ἀπομνησθήσεσθαι; 3, 114, 3 ὁμόρους < ΗΟΜΕΡΟΞ (cp. Wilamowitz, *l. c.*) = ὁμήρους; 4, 63, 1 τὸ ἥδη < ΤΟΞΕΔΕ = τοὺς ἥδη; 87, 1 λάβοιτε ἥ; 5, 34, 2 ἐλασσώθησεν < ΕΝΑCΘΕCΘΑΙ (cp. Wilamowitz, *l. c.*) = ἐλασσώσασθαι; 59, 3 ἦκον < ΕΧΟΝΕΚΟΝ = εἶχον ἦκον; 6, 20, 4 ἀπαρχὴ ἐσφέρεται; 34, 2 ἡ ἐξ < ΕΧΞ = ἐξ; 48 εἰδότας < ΕΕΙΔΟΤΑΞ = ἡ εἰδότας; 84, 1 ἥδη; 8, 29, 1 ἐς; 53, 3 δὴ; 55, 1 ἐκ < ΕΕΚ = ἡ ἐκ.

II A. 8, 48, 3 ἐκoinώνησαν < ΕΚΟΙΝΟCΑΝ (ΕΚΟΙΝΟΝΕCΑΝ cp. Wilamowitz, *l. c.*) = ἐκοίνωσαν.

² Cp. I. 4, 54, 1 εὔρον; 117, 2 εὐτύχει; 5, 7, 5 κεκλειμέναι; 72, 1 ξυγκλείσαι.

II B. 1, 20, 1 εὔρον.

III. 1, 71, 4 τρέφετε.

³ Cp. II B. 1, 12, 3 Δωριεῖς; 13, 6 Φωκαεῖς; 27, 2 Ἑρμιονεῖς; 2, 76, 4 Πλαταιεῖς; 6, 49, 3 ἀπολειφθῆναι.

III. 8, 90, 4 χεῖλη.

⁴ Cp. I. 2, 70, 4 ἦ; 87, 3 μῆ; 4, 33, 2 ἡδυνήθησαν, ἡδύναντο; 48, 3 ἡδύναντο; 6, 79, 3 ἡβούλοντο; 7, 19, 1 ἐπιγιγνομένων ἦρος < ΕΠΙΛΙΑΝΟΜΕΝΟΘΕΡΟΞ = ἐπιγιγνομένων θέρους.

II A. 2, 91, 1 νῆδς.

II B. 1, 3, 2 ἡδύνάτο.

III. 1, 43, 3 δέχησθε, ἀμύνετε.

4. E = ει tr. η. 3, 18, 4 ἐγκατωκοδόμηται; 7, 30, 2 ἐγκαταληφθὲν; 8, 98, 4 ληφθείσαν.¹

II. O = ω.²

5. O = ω tr. ο. 2, 25, 2 ἐσκεδασμένον, τετραμμένον; 34, 1 πρῶτον; 45, 1 τὸν ἀντίπαλον; 3, 34, 3 τὸν; 57, 3 ἀπολλύμεθα; 76 ἔφορμοι; 4, 78, 2 Νικονίδας; 6, 18, 4 ἄρξομεν, κακώσομεν; 7, 56, 3 μόνον; 66, 3 σφαλλόμενοι; 8, 48, 1 οἵπερ < ΟΙΓΕΡ = ὧιπερ; 64, 4 ὀρθοῦσθαι; 90, 4 τὸν ἐπὶ.³

6. O = ω tr. ου. 1, 37, 4 ἀναισχυντοῦσιν; 128, 5 οὗς; 3, 40, 3 ὁμοίους; 4, 93, 1 οὐκ ἐθεώρουν < ΟΥΚΕΘΕΟΡΟΝ = οὐκέθ' ἐώρων; 7, 8, 3 οὗς; 8, 64, 4 ὀρθοῦσθαι; 99 πού.⁴

7. O = ο tr. ω. 3, 18, 4 ἐγκατωκοδόμηται; 22, 3 ἐκατέρων; 45, 6 αὐτῶν; 81, 1 τῶν; 4, 106, 1 Ἀθηναίων; 5, 18, 10 Ἴσθμῶι; 7, 70, 2

¹ Cp. I. 1, 33, 1 καταθῃσθε; 7, 77, 1 ἤδη (cp. M 36 n. 193 *fin.*).

II B. 3, 92, 6 ἤρξαντο; 6, 14 ἡγή.

III. 1, 18, 2 ἔτη.

² Cp. I. 1, 3, 3 οὐδαμοῦ τοὺς < ΟΔΑΜΟΟΤΟΤΟΞ (cp. M 63) = οὐδαμοῦ οὕτω τοὺς; 42, 4 τῶι < ΤΟΤΟΙ = τὸ τῶι; 2, 21, 3 ὡς < ΕC (cp. Wilamowitz, *l. c.*) = εἰς; 96, 3 οὗ; 3, 40, 8 ὅς < ΟΞΟΞ = ὡς ὅς; 5, 34, 2 ἐλασσωθήσεσθαι (see above, p. 145, n. I I); 45, 2 ἀντιλέγειν < ΑΝΤΙΒΕΛΟΝ (cp. Wilamowitz, *l. c.*) = ἀντιλέγων; 77 and 79 passim; 6, 54, 6 τῶν < ΤΟΝΤΟΝ = τὸν τῶν; 8, 8, 1 ἐκoinωνοῦντο.

II A. 8, 48, 3 ἐκoinώνησαν (see above, p. 145, n. I II A); 56, 4 < τὸ > τῶν; 83, 2 Μλητον < τῶν >.

II B. 3, 82, 5 τυχόν.

III. 3, 68, 1 ἀγαθῶν; 76 τῶν; 4, 10, 3 ὅ; 8, 63, 3 προτρεψάντων.

³ Cp. I. 1, 62, 3 τὸ < ΤΟΙ = τῶι; 2, 93, 4 ἀπροσδοκῆται.

II A. 2, 62, 2 μόνον; 74, 3 πρότερον; 91, 1 νηὶς; 3, 45, 2 τοῦτο; 4, 63, 1 ἀποπέμπομεν; 7, 39, 1 πρότερον; 8, 104, 4 πρότερόν.

II B. 1, 23, 1 ἔργον; 29, 3 πλοῖμους; 50, 4 πλοῖμοις; 2, 49, 5 τὸ; 81, 8; 4, 92, 4; and 120, 2 ἀποθεν.

III. 1, 7 πλοῖμωτέρων; 29, 3 πλοῖμοις; 36, 3 τὸδ'; 37, 4 βιάζονται; 50, 4 πλοῖμοις; 71, 1 τὸ; 84, 3 τὸν νόμον; 2, 49, 7 ἀκροτηρίων; 61, 3 τὸ; 62, 1 κομποδεστέραν; 81, 8 ἀποθεν; 3, 31, 1 τὸ; 4, 92, 4 ἀποθεν; 5 τοσούτο; 120, 2 ἀποθεν; 8, 30, 2 τὸν; 83, 2 τοῦτον; 92, 6 ὁμογνώμων.

⁴ Cp. I. 1, 80, 4 τούτου; 8, 46, 1 αὐτοῦ.

II B. 3, 26, 1 ἐπιβοηθήσουσιν; 8, 56, 4 ἑαυτοῦ.

III. 3, 26, 1 ἐπιβοηθήσουσιν; 4, 32, 3 ἔχουσι; 64, 4 σωφρονοῦμεν.

προτέρων; 80, 4 ὥσπερ; 8, 4 ἀποστήσονται; 46, 5 προθύμως; 80, 1 ὥσπερ.¹

8. O = ου tr. ω. 1, 84, 3 ἀνομοίως; 2, 87, 3 ὀρθῶς; 89, 9 ὥστε < OΞTE = οὗς τε (cp. 3, 58, 4 τοῦναντίον); 3, 31, 1 ἀκουσίως; 56, 7 ἔχουσι; 65, 3 φιλίως, πολεμίως; 70, 1 ἀποστήσωσιν; 5, 35, 3 ἀναγκάσωσι; 102 ὀρθῶς; 6, 48 ἀπράκτως; 7, 25, 1 φράσωσιν; 63, 4 δικαίως ἂν < ΔΙΚΑΙΟΞΑΝ = δικαιοῦσαν; 8, 48, 4 στασιάσωσι; 89, 2 στρατηγῶν τῶν.²

III. E = ευ.³

9. E = ει tr. ε. 1, 3, 2 εἶχεν < EXEN = ἔχεν; 104, 1 and 4, 19, 2 πλέω; 8, 87, 4 ἐπιφανῆς.⁴

10. E = ε tr. ευ. 1, 3, 2 εἶχεν (see above, class 9); 2, 17, 2 προήδει;

¹ Cp. I. 1, 40, 6 ἐλάσσω; 129, 3 κεκωλύσθω < ΚΕΚΟΝΥΞ (C? cp. Wilamowitz, *l. c.*) O = κεκώλυσο; 2, 21, 2 ἐωράκεσαν; 76, 4 and 7, 25, 6 ἀνέκλων < ANEYKON = ἀνείλκον.

II A. 2, 42, 4 αὐτῶι τῶι < ΑΥΤΟΙΤΟ = αὐτῶι τὸ; 94, 3 Βουδώρου; 3, 44, 3 ὦ; 47, 3 τῶν; 4, 38, 1 προτέρων; 55, 1 ταχέως; 6, 14 ὥς; 8, 80, 1 ὥσπερ; 89, 2 οὐ τῶι.

II B. 1, 41, 2 τῶν; 56, 2 τιμωρήσονται; 6, 11, 7 φυλαζόμεθα; 41, 2 παρασκευασώμεθα.

III. 1, 12, 2 ἐνεώχμωσε; 13, 6 νίεως; 31, 3 βούλονται; 36, 3 τῶν; 37, 4 τούτῳ; 122, 1 αὐτῶν; 136, 1 φασκόντων; 3, 40, 6 διώλλυνται; 68, 1 τῶν, Μήδων; 4, 19, 2 παρῶν; 55, 1 ταχέως; 6, 41, 2 παρασκευασώμεθα; 4 οἴσωμεν; 49, 2 πείσονται; 8, 105, 3 τῶν νικησάντων.

² Cp. I. 6, 12, 2 νεωτέρωι; 36, 3 ἔμπειροι ὥσπερ < ΕΜΓΕΙ(?)ΡΟΙΟΙΟΞΠΕΡ = ἔμπειροι οἴουσπερ.

II A. 1, 62, 1 Ὀλύνθωι; 2, 42, 4 πλούτῳ; 7, 84, 4 ἀσμένως.

II B. 1, 19 πολιτεύσωσι; 144, 2 ἀμυνώμεθα; 8, 66, 5 ὥς.

III. 1, 144, 2 ἀμυνώμεθα; 2, 6, 2 ἔχουσι; 47, 1 τῶι πολέμῳ τούτῳ; 6, 12, 1 αὐτῶν; 7, 64, 1 πλευσωμένους; 8, 66, 5 ὥς.

³ Cp. above, classes 2 and 4; and I. 2, 21, 3 ὥς (see above, p. 146, n. 2 I); 4, 13, 1 ἔχεν < EXON (cp. Wilamowitz, *l. c.*) = ἔχον; 5, 45, 2 ἀντιλέγειν (see above, p. 146, n. 2 I); 59, 3 ἦκον (see above, p. 145, n. 1 I); 6, 13, 1 δόξει ἂν < ΔΟΧΞΕΕΑΝ = δόξει ἔαν; 21, 2 δέ < ΔΕΔΕ = δέ δεῖ.

II A. 1, 22, 4 and 23, 6 εἰς.

II B. 1, 1, 2 εἰς.

⁴ Cp. I. 1, 2, 6 μετοικίας ἐς; 7 ἔφερον; 2, 76, 4 ἀνέκλων (see above, n. 1 I); 4, 33, 1 καθεστήκεσαν; 78, 2 καθεστήκει; 5, 11, 1 περιέρξαντες; 7, 25, 6 ἀνέκλων (see above, on 2, 76, 4); 77, 4 θεοῦ (cp. M 36 n. 193 *fin.*).

II B. 3, 13, 7 ἔχετε.

86, 3 διέχeton < ΔΙΕΧΕΤΟΝ = διέχeton; 3, 66, 3 κτείνειν; 4, 127, 1 διαφθείρειν; 6, 33, 4 ἀνωφελεῖς; 87, 4 ἀδεεῖς; 8, 5, 5 ἀποκτείνειν.¹

IV. Ο = ου.²

II. Ο = ου tr. ο. 1, 77, 3 τὸν νόμον; 134, 4 ὁ; 2, 44, 1 ὀλοφύρομαι; 76, 2 τοῦτο; 81, 4; 87, 1; and 102, 4 τὸ; 45, 4 τοῦτο; 5 ἐπιβολήν; 82, 4 τὸ; 102, 4 ἀμυνομένων; 4, 92, 7 and 93, 3 ἀμυνομένους; 6, 14 τὸ; 40, 1 τοῦτο; 82, 3 ἀμυνόμεθα; 7, 63 1 ἀξιον; 67, 1 τὸ; 8, 9, 2 τὸ πιστόν; 81, 3 αὐτός; 87, 3 τὸ.³

12. Ο = ο tr. ου. 1, 132, 3 τοῦτο ἐδόκει < ΤΟΥΤΕΔΟΚΕΙ < ΤΟΤΕΔΟΚΕ (cp. M 63) = τότε ἐδόκει; 4, 31, 2 αὐτοῦ; 64, 1 ἀμυνομένων, προειδομένους, ὥστε αὐτοὺς; 118, 4 τοῦ; 6, 102, 2 ἀδυνάτους ἐσομένους; 104, 3 παρσκευασμένους; 7, 7, 1 τείχους; 43, 5 τοῦ.⁴

Summarizing, we find the evidence for E = η practically *nil*; for O = ω and spurious ου⁵ considerable, if a careful transliteration is presumed; for E = spurious ει, implied in that for O = ω,⁶ comparatively

¹ Cp. I. 1, 9, 3 and 3, 11, 1 πλείον; 12, 3 ἐκείνοις εἶναι < ΕΚΕΝΟΣΙΕΝΑΙ = ἐκείνους ἵεναι; 4, 118, 3 and 6, 91, 5 ἐπιμελεῖσθαι; 7, 8, 3 ἐπεμελεῖτο; 8, 39, 2 ξυπεπιμελεῖσθαι.

II A. 1, 72, 1 πλείονι.

² Cp. above, classes 6 and 8; and I. 2, 15, 4 τὸ < ΤΟΤΟ = τὸ τοῦ; 65, 11 πλοῦς ὅς < ΠΥΟΞ = πλοῦς; 96, 3 οὐ; 3, 89, 5 τοιούτου < ΤΟΙΟΥΤΟΤΟ = τοιούτου τὸ; 5, 77 and 79 passim; 6, 8, 3 τοῖς < ΤΟΤΟΙΞ = τοῦ τοῖς; 7, 19, 1 ἐπιγυγνομένου ἥρος (see above, p. 145, n. 4 I).

III. 8, 63, 3 προτρεψάντων.

³ Cp. I. 3, 12, 3 ἐκείνοις εἶναι (see above, n. 1 I); 4, 63, 1 τὸ ἤδη (see above, p. 145, n. 1 I); 92, 4 τούτοις; 7, 19, 1 ἐπιγυγνομένου ἥρος (see above, p. 145, n. 4 I); 71, 2 τὸ ἀνώμαλον.

II A. 1, 93, 6 ἐπιβολάς; 4, 35, 2 ἀμυνομένοι; 6, 34, 8 ἀμυνομένοις; 7, 63, 1 ἀξιον; 8, 81, 3 αὐτός.

II B. 1, 144, 2 ἀμυνόμεθα.

III. 1, 144, 2 ἀμυνόμεθα; 2, 91, 1 and 4, 35, 2 ἀμυνομένοι; 6, 34, 7 ἀμύνονται; 8 ἀμυνομένοις; 7, 64, 1 πλευσόμενος.

⁴ Cp. I. 1, 136, 4 ἐκείνου < ΕΚΕΝΟ = ἐκείνο or ἀσθενεστέρου ἐν < ΑΘΘΕ-ΝΕΚΤΕΡΟCΕΝ (cp. Wilamowitz, *l. c.*) = ἀσθενέστερος ἐν; 3, 67, 7 τοὺς ξύμπαντας (see above, p. 144, n. 4).

II A. 7, 44, 8 ριπτοῦντες (cp. 2, 49, 5).

II B. 3, 86, 2 Συρακούσιοι.

III. 2, 86, 3 τοῦ; 3, 86, 2 Συρακούσιοι; 7, 39, 2 ἐπιμελουμένους.

⁵ Cp. Marchant's ed. of Book II, introd. p. xxvii; who, however, thinks of it as an argument for Thucydides' use of the full Attic alphabet.

⁶ Cp. above pp. 134, 135, n. 4, 142, n. 5.

rare but convincing. Does the position in the alphabetic development thus indicated for the History, namely, a point somewhere between the adoption of $H = \eta$ and that of $\Omega = \omega$, tally with data obtainable from the external sources?

Born not later than 452 B.C., probably at least ten years earlier,¹ Thucydides had ended his elementary schooling by 440: what alphabet or alphabets had he then learned? A private tutor might go to almost any extreme of Ionicism. But in any case he must have acquired at least a reading knowledge of the Attic characters; and if, as seems far more likely, he followed the custom of well-born Athenians and with other boys attended the class of a *grammatistes*, the possibility that he may have read Homer in Ionic letters is more than counterbalanced by the practical certainty that he learned to write as well as read a rather conservative school Attic alphabet. For after a half century of development probably not more radical than that of inscriptional usage, Archinus could find it advisable to specify that schools must thenceforth give instruction in the Ionic system²: whether or not the decree was in confirmation of an already established practice, whether or not it provided for the exclusion of the old alphabet, we are not told; it must, however, have had reference to professional *grammatistai*, and can hardly fail to point to some backwardness among a calling proverbially slow to adopt new methods: nor from such indications as we possess with regard to Thucydides' family, is it likely that he received less than respectably conservative training in language.

He began the notes for his History in 431; the actual composition, according to Ullrich, ten years later, according to the less probable theory of Classen in 404. The latter date only need be considered, since from 424 the twenty years' exile, spent doubtless for the most part in the retirement of his Thracian estates,³ practically isolated the historian from Athenian society. Thucydides' alphabet, if indeed beginning the History before 404 he employed the Attic in its composition,

¹ Pamphila's dating, about 470, is at once the earliest and the best supported.

² See Usener, *Rheinisches Museum*, XXV (1870), p. 591; Kretschmer, *Gr. Vaseninschriften*, p. 106, n. 2; L 453 nn. 9 *fin.*, 11.

³ Cp. Classen's edition of Book I, 1897⁴, revised by Steup, introd. pp. xxvi f.; Wilamowitz, *Hom. Vorfr.*, p. 313.

— we have seen that he may have been familiar with the Ionic,¹— was not more modern than the literary Attic of 424, probably not more than that of 431. But the strongest advocates of 404 as the first date of actual composition admit that long passages had previously been worked into a form practically final; nor is it likely that Thucydides the ultra-conservative should at the verge of seventy have changed his handwriting to suit a mode which upon his return to the new Athens he found had become approved usage there in his absence.

In ascertaining the inscriptional evidence for literary usage during the period between 470 and 424, the ideal procedure, once more, involves a complete review and tabulation of the comparative frequency in both public and private inscriptions of Attic and of Ionic forms from the introduction of these. The investigations of Köhler² have made clear that with regard to their employment of Ionic forms Attic inscriptions fall into three fairly distinct classes: sepulchral, votive, and public inscriptions proper. “. . . Die mitgetheilten Texte beweisen, dass das jonische Alphabet in Athen um die Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts für private Aufzeichnungen auf Stein verwandt worden ist; es kann nicht wohl anders gedacht werden, als dass es in den litterarisch gebildeten und thätigen Kreisen schon in der vorhergehenden Epoche im Gebrauch gewesen ist. Wenn daher die Weihinschriften in attischem Alphabet bis an das Ende des fünften Jahrhunderts herabreichen, so ist daraus zu schliessen, dass man für die zur Aufstellung in öffentlichen Heiligthümern bestimmten Aufzeichnungen andern Grundsätzen gefolgt ist und an der alten Schrift festgehalten hat, so lange der Staat sich derselben für seine amtlichen Aufzeichnungen bediente. Dagegen giebt es eine andere Classe von Denkmälern, welche genau dieselben Erscheinungen der Schrift aufweist wie die Grabsteine aus der nachpersischen Zeit und von diesen nicht getrennt werden kann. Auf rothfigurigen Vasen findet man . . . attische und jonische Zeichen in den Formen der Uebergangszeit neben einander verwendet. . . . Grabinschriften in attischem Alphabet und vollkommen regelmässiger Schrift sind nicht vorhanden. . . . Auf den Steinen der Uebergangszeit überwiegt das jonische Alphabet. Alles drängt zu dem Schluss, dass dieses spätestens

¹ Above, p. 149.

² *Att. Grabsteine*, esp. pp. 358–361, 378–379; cp. L 450.

seit dem Anfang des peloponnesischen Krieges in Attika allgemein in den Grabinschriften angewendet worden sei."¹ That the early use in grave inscriptions of the Ionic alphabet² necessarily implies its contemporary or still earlier adoption by the literary classes, and by Thucydides in particular, is surely questionable. Individual conservatism has, in each instance, to be reckoned with, nor are literary men as a class always the first to acquiesce in spelling reform. In any case, the number of sepulchral and votive inscriptions which anticipate the Euclidean changes is too small to render an experiment at dating the appearance in them of Ionic usages at all conclusive: I attempt only to approximate very roughly the dates of such appearances in public inscriptions. These dates, of course, so far from being taken *a priori* to fix the corresponding dates for Thucydides, are rather to be regarded as the last limit of their respective usages; certainly for this object they are valid, and probably also as indications of the order in which conservative Athens adopted the Ionic forms. (See table, p. 152.)

From such approximations it seems at least reasonable to infer that of Ionic forms Thucydides may have employed only H = η and certain consonants; but all calculation is, of course, rendered uncertain by the discrepancy, capable of infinite extension, which is presumed to have existed between the usage of even private inscriptions and that of the Athenian literary circle. Yet the much-cited Callias must have been withal something of a fancier in alphabets.³ A fragment of Euripides' *Theseus* affords evidence for a contemporary popular usage H = η⁴; nor is the *Theseus* among the latest plays. But it is interesting to ask whether, even if it were, the anachronism of H = η on an Attic hero's shield can have escaped the audience: and there have been more extreme reactionaries than Euripides. Further, according to a scholiast, who may have erred in extending the application of a predecessor's note, even Euripides wrote O = ω. The scholium in question⁵ deals

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 378 f.

² It is to be noted that a considerable proportion of the epitaphs cited by Köhler are of other than native Attic citizens; see esp. pp. 367 ff.

³ See Ath. 7, 276 A; 10, 454: L 430.

⁴ See Ath. 10, 454 B; Wilamowitz, *Hom. Vorfr.*, p. 303; Blass, in Müller's *Handbuch*, I², 1892, p. 303; L *ibid.*

⁵ See Dindorf, *Scholia Graeca in Euripidis Tragoedias*, 1863, vol. III, pp. 191 f.; Gardthausen, *Gr. Palaeographie*, p. 107.

APPEARANCE OF IONIC FORMS IN ATTIC INSCRIPTIONS *

Appears First		Rarely	Frequently	Regularly
\hbar omitted ¹	575-525 ² /470-460 ³	485 ⁴ /470 ⁵	470 ⁶ /450 ⁷	403
H = η ⁸	525-480 ⁹ /480-447 ¹⁰	465 ¹¹ /425 ¹²	410 ¹³	403
Ω = ω ⁸	480-460 ¹⁴ /500-475 ¹⁵	445 ¹⁶ /430 ⁸ ¹²	405 ⁸ ¹²	403
Λ = λ ¹⁷	472 \pm ? ¹⁸ /soon after 431 ¹⁹	460 ²⁰ /420 ¹²	412 ¹²	403
Γ ¹⁷	472 \pm ? ¹⁸ /431-426 ²¹	460 ²² /410 ²³	407 ²³	403
Ξ ¹⁷	480-447 ²⁴ /480-450 ²⁵	430 ²⁶ /—	410 ²⁷	403
Υ ¹⁷	480-460 ²⁸	430 ²⁹	410 ²⁷	403
E = sp. ϵ ³⁰	575-525 ³¹ /soon after 575 ³²	525 ³¹ /430 ³³	445-403 ³⁴ /403 ³⁵	376 ³⁶
OY = sp. ov ³⁷	500-480 ³⁸ /480-445 ³⁹	445-403 ³⁴ /410 ¹²		353 ⁴⁰

¹ M 85. False aspiration first 600-575 (IS (41) 373 b 2, L 394 f.) / soon after 575 (IGA 492, L 399).

² IS (101) 373²¹⁴, L 404.

³ I 13, S (140) 26 a, L 438. Cp. IS (137) 18-19, L 422; IS (3, 133) I, L 436.

⁴ L 422, 433.

⁵ L 436, 438.

⁶ L 435, 437.

⁷ L 433, 441-444.

⁸ M 4, which omits all the earlier instances of H = η .

⁹ IS (182) 373¹²¹, (97) 373¹⁷⁷, L 429.

¹⁰ I 23, L 442; cp. IS

(51) 507 a, L 434, 436, 441.

¹¹ L 434, 436, 438.

¹² L 449.

¹³ L 442, 449.

¹⁴ IS (191) 561, L 438; cp. Ω = ov (?) I 358, S (182) 373¹²¹.

¹⁵ IS (134) 2 a (Ω = o and ω), L 428; cp. IS (191) 561, L 438.

¹⁶ L 442, 444.

¹⁷ M 5.

¹⁸ I 418, L 434.

¹⁹ I 443, L 449; but cp.

I 438, L 439; IS (51)

505 a, L 436.

²⁰ L 438 f.

²¹ I 40, 443, L 448.

²² L 438 f., 442.

²³ L 448.

²⁴ IS (183) 418 h, L 441 f.

²⁵ I 440, L 434, 439.

²⁶ L 444, 446.

²⁷ L 447.

²⁸ I 13, L 434, 437.

²⁹ L 446 f.

³⁰ M 20.

³¹ L 407.

³² IGA 492, L 401, 407.

³³ M 21 n. 110.

³⁴ L 450.

³⁵ L 445.

³⁶ L 456.

³⁷ M 26.

³⁸ I 360, L 429; cp. I 483, L 408.

³⁹ I 31 A, L 444.

⁴⁰ L 462.

* When two dates are given, the former is for private inscriptions.

with a variant in *Phoen.* 682: σοί νιν ἔκγονοι] γράφεται καὶ “σῶι νιν ἔκγόνωι κτίσαν,” ἢ τῶι ἔκγόνωι σου, τῶι Κάδμωι, αἱ θεαὶ κατέκτισαν τὰς Θήβας. γέγονε δὲ περὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἀμάρτημα. ἕως ἀρχοντος γὰρ Ἀθήνησιν Εὐκλείδου, μήπω τῶν μακρῶν εὐρημένων, τοῖς βράχεσιν ἀντὶ τῶν μακρῶν ἐχρῶντο τῶι εἰ ἀντὶ τοῦ η καὶ τῶι ο ἀντὶ τοῦ ω. ἔγραφον οὖν τὸ δῆμωι μετὰ τοῦ ι (*sic*) δῆμοι. μὴ νοήσαντες δὲ ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν γραφὴν ἔστι καὶ δεῖ μετατεθεῖναι τὸ ο εἰς τὸ ω, ἐτάραξαν τὸ νοητόν. Of course the writing δῆμοι may be simply the result of a stupid or careless failure to apply the first half of the principle stated just above; it may be something more, and in contemplation of the exact counterpart ΔΗΜΟΙ occurring repeatedly in public inscriptions,¹ one finds difficulty in regarding it otherwise. Finally, may not there be deduced from the vase of Duris,²—testimony in any case valid only for an East Aegaeon dialect,—new and startling functions of the ethical dative? But when all is said, there still remains the dangerous possibility that literary Athens of the fifth century may have been innovative, that Thucydides' conservatism may have been too much stressed; and we look for a test, based on some process reasonably parallel to a phonetic development, by which to measure with some accuracy, if possible, the historian's anticipation (supposing he Atticized at all) of inscriptional reforms. Such a test presents itself in the form of a comparison between his text,—which here rests on authority so far as I am aware universally accepted,³—and the inscriptions with respect to their use of ξύν, summarized by Meisterhans⁴ as follows:

460-410 B.C. ξύν: σύν = 75 : 21

410-403 B.C. ξύν: σύν = 9 : 50

So far in advance of inscriptional practice may Thucydides, from our best determinative evidence, be presumed to stand that he uses not at

¹ E.g., I 51 S (15).

² See Kretschmer, *Gr. Vasenschriften*, pp. 104 f.; L. 430.

³ See “Marcellinus” Life, 52; Stahl, *Quaest. Gramm.*, p. 50.

⁴ See pp. 220 f.: “Von 403 an trifft man ξύν nur noch vereinzelt in Ausdrücken wie ξυνάρχοντες, ξυμβάλλεσθαι, ξύμβολον, ξυμβολή, ξύμμαχος. Seit 378 hört auch dieser Gebrauch auf und ξύν erhält sich nur noch in der formelhaften Wendung γνώμην δὲ ξυμβάλλεσθαι τῆς βουλῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον ὅτι δοκεῖ τῇ βουλῇ . . . in und mit welcher Formel ξύν sich bis ins I. Jahrhundert v. Chr. behauptet.” Cp. the persistence of H = h in ΗΟΡΟΞ (M 6, L 452).

all an Ionic form which in public inscriptions appeared with frequency by 410, regularly by 403, and except in a single recurring formula altogether supplanted its Attic equivalent by 378, two years before the general adoption of EI = spurious $\epsilon\iota$, and twenty-five years before that of OY = spurious $\omicron\upsilon$.¹ It follows from a comparison of the dates of both occasional and regular appearance that of Attic forms Thucydides may well have used O = ω , υ , Λ = γ , $X\zeta$, and $\Phi\zeta$, possibly even H = \hbar and E = η ; that he certainly used E and O in the diphthongs.² For the last survival of Attic writing, O = $\omicron\upsilon$ spurious, a margin of fifty years is attested.

¹ Cp. Thucydides' use of *alei* ("Marcellinus," 52; M 31, 33): see Marchant's ed. of Book II, introd. pp. xxvi f. On the other hand, use of $-\sigma\sigma- = -\tau\tau-$, an Ionicism which never found its way into Attic prose, is incapable of measurement as an index to the place of an Attic historian in an Attic development; but cp. above, pp. 135 with n. 3, 149 *fn*. If, however, this use is made an argument for that of the Ionic alphabet also in the History, it is to be noted that the argument is independent of other considerations here advanced, and as such does not affect their validity.

² Have we not, in brief, to recognize that in the Athens of 430 there existed a condition of spelling reform not very much farther advanced than exists at present in eastern Massachusetts? namely, tradespeople and artists employing, with greater or less freedom, a "simplified spelling," ignored by the state in school and record, and by the large majority of men of letters either unused or tolerated for occasional writing only. Shakespeare and Milton are presented to the schoolboy in seventeenth century orthography; their irregular spellings are pointed out and explained to him; he is told that the period represents the best attainment of English literary genius: but where shall you find the school which permits, much less encourages him to imitate such of those spellings as are included among the Three Hundred Words? Nor in the transaction of public business has the Commonwealth ever accepted a departure from established usage: for information about the practice of the several departments I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. Francis T. Crafts, of the Department of State.